Application of: Colin Cook et al.
Serial No.:   10/792,284
Filed: 3/4/2004
Request for Reconsideration dated September 13, 2011

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the following discussions, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5 are currently pending in the application. Claims 6-16 have been canceled previously. No claims have been amended, canceled or added herewith. The pending claims are the same claims previously under appeal and based on the same primary reference that was used in the rejection of the claims on appeal -- only the secondary references have been withdrawn.

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0383334 (hereinafter "the '334 publication"). That ground for rejection is respectfully traversed.

In the previous grounds for rejection, the Office Action admitted that the '334 publication did not teach "if no black border is found [near] to [the] expected border location, discarding the adjusted screen border and loading a predetermined set of values for the screen border." The Office Action has now rescinded that position and alleges that paragraph [0060] teaches "if no black border is found near to the expected border location, discarding the adjusted screen border and loading a predetermined set of values for the screen border." The Office Action also alleges that paragraphs [0059]-[0063] teach "if a black border is found near to the expected border location, using the screen resolution of the host computer detected at the VPS instead of discarding the adjusted screen border and loading a predetermined set of values for the screen border." The Office Action supports its rejection by stating:

Schneider [the '334 publication] teaches the condition where if no black
border is found near the expected border location, discarding the adjusted screen
border and loading a predetermined set of values for the screen border, during the
optimization process. During the underlined short[en]ing process, hightlight[ed]
above, if a non-black pixel is found during the shortening period the front porch is
reverted back to the front porch value in the iteration before. For example, a

2

Application of: Colin Cook et al.
Serial No.:   10/792,284
Filed: 3/4/2004
Request for Reconsideration dated September 13, 2011

VESA resolution is loaded, the front porch is shortened and if a non-black pixel is
found discarding the front porch adjustment and loading the original VESA
resolution which was originally correct.

However, based on the example provided in the Office Action, it can be seen that the Office
Action still has not shown that the '334 publication teaches "if no black border is found [near] to
[the] expected border location, discarding the adjusted screen border and loading a
predetermined set of values for the screen border," as had been admitted by previous Office
Actions. The process described by the Office Action actually detected that a black border was
present (by detecting that there was black and then detecting that the adjacent pixel was not
black), and the process then used "the screen resolution of the host computer detected at the VPS
instead of discarding the adjusted screen border and loading a predetermined set of values for the
screen border." The Office Action has not shown what happens when no black border is
detected. As such, the claims are patentable over the '334 publication as they have not been
shown to be anticipated by the '334 publication.

Application of: Colin Cook et al.
Serial No.: 10/792,284
Filed: 3/4/2004
Request for Reconsideration dated September 13, 2011

Consequently, in light of the above discussions, the outstanding ground for rejection is believed to have been overcome and the pending claims are in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

CHARGE STATEMENT: Deposit Account No. 501860, order no. **2540-0702**.
The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee specifically authorized hereafter, or any missing or insufficient fee(s) filed, or asserted to be filed, or which should have been filed herewith or concerning any paper filed hereafter, and which may be required under Rules 16-18 (<u>missing or insufficiencies only</u>) now or hereafter relative to this application and the resulting Official Document under Rule 20, or credit any overpayment, to our Accounting/ Order Nos. shown above, for which purpose a <u>duplicate</u> copy of this sheet is attached.   **This CHARGE STATEMENT <u>does not authorize</u> charge of the <u>issue fee</u> until/unless an issue fee transmittal sheet is filed.**

CUSTOMER NUMBER **42624**	Respectfully submitted, By: / Michael R. Casey / _____ Michael R. Casey (Reg. No. 40,294)
Davidson Berquist Jackson & Gowdey LLP 4300 Wilson Blvd., 7th Floor, Arlington, Virginia 22203 Main: (703) 894-6400 ● FAX: (703) 894-6430	